

COMMENTS BY ZOOLOGISTS ON THE DRAFT CODE  
Z.N.(S.) 2250

(1) *Comment on Draft Article 58*, by J.D. Holloway and G.S. Robinson (*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, and British Museum (Natural History), London SW7 5BD*)

Kudrna (1978, *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 35: 82) has drawn attention to the fact that etymological expertise is needed in order to interpret Article 58 of the Code. We agree that the need for etymological expertise in the interpretation of the Code should be eliminated wherever possible. Mr Kudrna's proposal attempts to deal with confusion arising from interpretation of the phrase 'of the same origin and meaning' by removing this phrase altogether. However, this proposal is not in the interests of stability as it will increase the number of species-group names deemed to be junior primary homonyms. These would require replacement even though they are not currently considered to be congeneric and are not liable to cause any confusion. This situation will be aggravated whenever additions are made to the 'single-letter differences' listed in Article 58.

2. An example of the potential effect on stability of Mr Kudrna's proposal may be found in the case of *Papilio aristaeus* Stoll 1780, and a possible junior primary homonym, *Papilio (Satyrus) aristaeus* Bonelli, 1826. These species-group names are of different origin and meaning as shown by Tremewan (1978, *Entomologist's Gaz.*, vol. 29: 70–73), but were treated as homonymous by Kudrna (1977, *A revision of the genus Hipparchia Fabricius*, (Classey, Faringdon), 300 pp.). The name *Hipparchia aristaeus* (Bonelli) has had extensive use and is found widely in popular reference literature on European butterflies. *Papilio aristaeus* Stoll is a Moluccan species now placed in the genus *Graphium* Scopoli (PAPILIONIDAE). The Code as it now stands permits retention of the name *aristaeus* and thus contributes to stability. Mr Kudrna's proposal would lead to *aristaeus* being replaced.

3. There is, however, an alternative solution to the etymological problem. We suggest that, as in the case of genus-group names, even a one-letter difference in spelling (such as those listed in Article 58) is sufficient to differentiate a species-group name for the purposes of primary homonymy. Confusion of the user of nomenclature by such small spelling differences arises only when such species-group names come together in current generic combinations.

4. We therefore propose that the first paragraph of Article 58 be redrafted as follows:

'Minor variant spellings deemed to be homonyms. — When species-group names that differ in spelling in any of the following respects are treated as congeneric, they are deemed to be secondary homonyms.'

5. This proposal is supported by B.L. d'Abrera, D.S. Fletcher, S.H. Halsey, W.G. Tremewan, P.E.S. Whalley and E.P. Wiltshire. The following supported Mr Kudrna's original proposal but on reflection consider the above proposal to be a better solution to the problem: P. Ackery, J.D. Bradley, D.J. Carter, A.H. Hayes, I.W.B. Nye, A.D. Palmer, R.D. Pope, M. Shaffer, R. Smiles, R.I. Vane-Wright, A. Watson.

#### AUTHORS' NOTE

In circulating this proposal among colleagues, we encountered a variety of opinions. Some felt we should have gone further and sought to remove Article 58 altogether, or sought to restrict homonymy purely to names in current combinations, i.e. secondary homonymy. Others felt that it would be unwise to separate the concepts of primary and secondary homonymy in the manner we suggest or pointed out that our proposal might create problems with regard to homonymy involving diacritic marks or Article 30. Problems were also envisaged where primary homonyms have already been established under Article 58 but would be revoked by acceptance of our proposal.

The acceptance or rejection of any proposal for changes to Article 58 may turn on the relative proportions of

- (a) primary homonyms already established under Article 58;
- (b) the likely number of such still to be discovered; and
- (c) the proportion of (a) and (b) in current combinations.

A case can be made for retaining the Code as it stands in the hope that the phrase 'of the same origin and meaning' will provide a loophole whereby, when the etymological situation is unclear, a taxonomist can arbitrate in the interests of stability. We therefore submit our proposal to the Commission to ensure that all alternatives are considered along with that of Mr Kudrna as it is evident that most of the signatories to his proposal have had second thoughts about it.